

**Remarks/Arguments**

Reconsideration of this application is requested.

**Extension of Time**

A request for a one month extension of the period for response to the office action mailed on November 14, 2007 is enclosed. The extended period for response expires on March 14, 2008.

**Specification**

The specification is amended as suggested to correct the noted clerical errors on pages 20 and 28.

**Claim Status**

Claims 1-22 are pending. Claim 5 is amended.

**Claim Objections**

Claim 5 is amended as suggested to correct the noted clerical errors.

**Claim Rejections – 35 USC 102**

Claims 1-22 are rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as anticipated by Takatsu (US 6,535,702). In response, applicant traverses the rejections.

**Claims 1 and 7**

Claim 1 recites that contents of jobs not yet executed by the facsimile control section are:

*...displayed one by one on the display unit in order each time a user presses the button on the input unit...*

Independent claim 7 similarly recites that contents of jobs not yet executed by the job execution section are displayed one by one on the display section in order each time a user presses the button on the input unit. Thus, as shown for example in applicant's FIGS. 6(A)-(D) and 7(A)-(D), and described for example at page 24,

line 7 to page 26, line 19, facsimile job information display screens are displayed one-by-one on screen 31 each time a user presses buttons 52R and 52L.

The Action asserts states that Takatsu discloses this feature at col. 4, lines 1-65. Applicant disagrees. In Takatsu, two jobs that are in progress are simultaneously displayed in upper and lower stages of status indication portion 21 (see col. 4, lines 56-65; and FIG. 2). There is no disclosure or suggestion that jobs are displayed one by one each time a user presses an input button.

Since Takatsu does not disclose each and every feature of claims 1 and 7, it cannot anticipate claims 1 and 7 or claims 2, 8-11 and 22 dependent thereon.

#### Claims 3 and 5

Independent claim 3 recites that contents of incomplete jobs are displayed on the display unit one by one in the order of the read job and the facsimile transmission job, and that when facsimile transmission jobs are present in response to a user input, the contents of the facsimile transmission jobs are displayed in inverse order of management start time of each facsimile transmission job. Independent claim 5 similarly recites that contents of incomplete jobs are displayed on the display unit one by one in the order of the read job, the facsimile transmission job, the print job and the facsimile reception job in response to a user input, and that when facsimile transmission jobs are present, the contents of the facsimile transmission jobs are displayed in inverse order of management start time of each facsimile transmission job.

The Action asserts that Takatsu discloses this feature at col. 7, lines 35-50. Applicant disagrees. In this passage, with reference to FIG. 6A, Takatsu discloses that jobs that are in progress, reserved, etc., are represented by cards to having tabs 23. The content of a job is displayed when the user presses the corresponding tab. Thus, the contents of jobs are displayed in arbitrary order depending on the timing and order by which a user presses the tab keys. On the other hand, in the present

invention, the contents of the jobs are displayed in a predetermined order, based on a set priority by job type.

Furthermore, according to the present invention, when facsimile transmission jobs are present, they are displayed in an inverse order of management start time. Takatsu clearly does not disclose such a feature.

Since Takatsu does not disclose each and every feature of claims 3 and 5, it cannot anticipate claims 3 and 5 or claims 4 and 6 dependent thereon.

#### Claims 12 and 18

Independent claims 12 and 18 recite that, when a button on an input unit is pressed to cancel a job, the job to be canceled is selected by way of a predetermined algorithm from the running or waiting jobs in the job execution section. In the invention, when the button is pressed, the user can cancel the job which is selected by way of a predetermined algorithm without displaying the list of the jobs.

In Takatsu, by contrast, a user cancels a job reservation by depressing reservation job listing key 36 to display the reserved job list and then selects a job to be canceled (see col. 8, lines 54-59). There is no disclosure or suggestion that a job to be canceled is selected by a predetermined algorithm.

Since Takatsu does not disclose each and every feature of claims 12 and 18, it cannot anticipate claims 12 and 18 or claims 13-17 and 19-21 dependent thereon.

For these reasons, the rejections of claims 1-22 under 35 USC 102(e) should be withdrawn.

#### **Conclusion**

This application is now in condition for allowance. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned to resolve any issues that remain after consideration and entry of this amendment.


Appl. No. 10/810,341  
Amdt. dated March 14, 2008  
Reply to Office Action of November 14, 2007

Atty. Ref. 88518.0002  
Customer No. 26021

Any fees due with this response may be charged to our Deposit Account No.  
50-1314.

Respectfully submitted,  
HOGAN & HARTSON L.L.P.

Date: March 14, 2008

By:   
Troy M. Schmelzer  
Registration No. 36,667  
Attorney for Applicant(s)

1999 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 1400  
Los Angeles, California 90067  
Phone: 310-785-4600  
Fax: 310-785-4601